



STATE OF MICHIGAN
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
LANSING



JENNIFER M. GRANHOLM
GOVERNOR

MICHAEL P. FLANAGAN
SUPERINTENDENT OF
PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

TO State Board of Education

FROM: Mike Flanagan 

DATE: December 1, 2005

**SUBJ: DETERMINATION OF ADEQUATE YEARLY
PROGRESS FOR 2005-06**

The State Board of Education has held previous discussions on the minimum subgroup size for determining Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for the 2006 report cards that will be issued to schools and school districts later this spring. In addition, two other aspects of AYP were presented during the discussion. As a result, final proposals are being presented in this document.

AYP Determination by Grade Range

Michigan has been determining AYP separately by grade range at the elementary (grades 4 and 5, where the MEAP tests are given) and middle school (grades 7 and 8). In a school with overlapping grades (e.g. K-8 or 7-12 school) an AYP determination has been made separately (that is, a K-8 school would receive both an elementary AYP determination and a middle school AYP determination). In such cases, however, the AYP determination at the highest grade range in the school is used to determine the school's phase for consequences under the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB). In the case of the K-8 school, for instance, AYP for the school would be based on the middle school grades. In the case of a 7-12 school, AYP would be based on the high school. The assumption is that the school's curriculum is vertically aligned and that the highest grade range represents the culmination of the school's instructional program.

For 2006, Michigan will develop vertically articulated (that is, aligned from grade to grade) performance standards for MEAP and MI-Access. The assessments will report proficiency for each grade tested (3-8) at each school. The performance standards (cut scores) will result in assessments where the difficulty at a particular grade level will be very similar to the difficulty at adjacent grade levels. The State Board of Education will be asked to approve the performance standards in January, 2006. The scores of all tested students must be used in the AYP determination because valid

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

KATHLEEN N. STRAUS – PRESIDENT • JOHN C. AUSTIN – VICE PRESIDENT
CAROLYN L. CURTIN – SECRETARY • MARIANNE YARED MCGUIRE – TREASURER
NANCY DANHOF – NASBE DELEGATE • ELIZABETH W. BAUER
REGINALD M. TURNER • EILEEN LAPPIN WEISER

608 WEST ALLEGAN STREET • P.O. BOX 30008 • LANSING, MICHIGAN 48909
www.michigan.gov/mde • (517) 373-3324

scores in English language arts and mathematics cannot be ignored. **The issue to be decided is the organization of the data used to determine AYP for a school.**

One option is to set a single separate AYP proficiency target for elementary (3-5) and a single AYP target for middle school (6-8). The targets would be consistent with current targets if the percentages of students passing the MEAP tests at each grade range are comparable to prior year data. It may be confusing for schools with configurations that overlap elementary and middle schools (K-8 schools). The "highest grade range" rule would still be needed for a school such as a K-8 school where the grade configuration overlaps grades 5-6.

A second option is to set separate statewide AYP proficiency targets for each grade level, and then combine the separate grade level targets to develop a target for the school as a whole, using a weighted average of the statewide targets for the grades tested at the school. In other words, based on student performance on the grade level tests, state targets would be established for each grade, 3 through 8. A school's elementary target, for instance, would be based on what grade levels were in the school. A K-5 school would have a different school AYP target than a K-6 school.

This option would account for differences in performance standards across grade levels. This would permit a single AYP determination for the school, through a comparison between a school's target and the state target. The only potential drawback is that schools would have different targets based on the school's grade configuration.

Staff recommends this second option because it will result in a single AYP determination for each school that is based on all of the students assessed in that school.

Minimum Group Size

The State Board of Education has previously approved (with subsequent approval by the U. S. Department of Education) a minimum group size of thirty (30).

Up until this year, when we began assessing all grades, 3 through 8, a school's AYP status was determined by the performance of just one grade in the school (for example, 4th grade for English Language Arts). The group size of 30 was applied to the students assessed at this grade level.

Now, with all students in grades 3 through 8 being assessed, the question arises as to whether the minimum group size previously applied to just one grade level should continue to be applied to multiple grades, with increased numbers of students being tested, or

whether it should be increased in some proportion to the increased number of students now being tested.

In this respect, there are several points of view:

The minimum group size should be increased, particularly so that schools with large student enrollments do not have their AYP determinations potentially hinge on a small subgroup of 30 students. (In recent months, the state board was presented with the case of a high school of 2,400 students that did not make AYP because of a 30-student subgroup.)

- The minimum group size should be maintained at 30, even though more students are being assessed and AYP is based on this larger number of students. The NCLB law requires a subgroup size to be set which is "statistically reliable," meaning that the number is large enough to be representative of a larger group. The fact that more students are now being assessed makes the number of 30 even more statistically reliable and there is no need to increase this. A larger number will not increase statistical reliability.

Proposal

At the meeting of the State Board of Education on November 15, a proposal was made to request of the U. S. Department of Education a revision in Michigan's minimum group size from a current thirty (30) to thirty-plus-10% of the total number of students tested, with a cap of 150 on the minimum group size for very large schools.

Board member discussion focused on several issues:

The fact that a larger group size might enable more schools to make AYP by "hiding" certain subgroups from having to receive the attention they deserve in order to be "proficient" by 2014.

The fact that a larger group size might increase the number of small schools not having to include subgroups in AYP calculations. The current group size of 30 already results in some small schools determining AYP without including particular subgroups.

Staff are now recommending the board's consideration and approval of a formula for minimum group size that is based on 30-plus-10% but with a variation that would limit group size increases for smaller schools, and would still maintain the cap of 150 for very large schools. For small schools the group size rules would be as follows:

Number of Student Tested	Minimum Group Size
100 or less	30
101-125	35
126-150	40
151 or more	30 plus 10%

In approving amendments to a state's Accountability Workbook, the U. S. Department of Education has stated that it will not favorably consider amendments that appear to have the intent, or the effect, of increasing the number of schools making AYP. For this purpose, staff in the Office of Educational Assessment and Accountability have developed projections on the number of schools that would be affected by applying a 30-plus-10% minimum group size to all schools, with the exception of the rules proposed above for small schools. The following tables depict the results.

Table 1

By way of a frame of reference, **Table 1** depicts: a) the number of schools whose AYP determinations in 2005 were not based on a subgroup (because the size was below 30) and, of the schools that were, b) the number that made AYP and c) did not make AYP because of a particular subgroup.

2004-05 Tests in Grades 4,7,8 and 11 - n size of 30			
	NOT Counted for AYP	Made AYP	Did NOT Make AYP
Black	2,126	272	219
American Indian	1,300	6	1
Asian American	1,679	35	2
Hispanic	2,222	38	29
White	1,130	2,086	89
Multiracial	719	5	-
Limited English	1,298	35	24
Special Ed	2,896	129	209
Economically Disadvantaged	2,087	799	335

Table 2

Table 2 depicts two effects. The shaded columns in the center depict the projected 2006 results of applying to all schools the 30-plus-10% of total students assessed. The columns to the right depict the results of applying the same rule to all schools except smaller schools, in which case the rules at the top of the columns apply.

2005-06 Tests in Grades 3-11						
	$n = 30 + (\text{Tested} * 10\%)$ (Maximum: 150)			IF Tested ≤ 100 $n = 30$ IF $101 \geq \text{Tested} \geq 125$ $n = 35$ IF $126 \geq \text{Tested} > 150$ $n = 40$ IF Tested > 150 $n = 30 + (\text{Tested} * 10\%)$ (Maximum: 150)		
	NOT Counted for AYP	Would Make AYP	Would NOT Make AYP	NOT Counted for AYP	Would Make AYP	Would NOT Make AYP
Black	1,906	441	270	1,883	458	276
American Indian	1,292	11	4	1,290	13	4
Asian American	1,684	32	-	1,684	32	-
Hispanic	2,202	63	24	2,198	65	26
White	809	2,376	120	777	2,403	125
Multiracial	716	7	1	716	7	1
Limited English	1,252	71	34	1,249	74	34
Special Ed	2,921	159	154	2,907	166	161
Economically Disadvantaged	1,533	1,313	375	1,473	1,354	394

Observations

1. In both scenarios in **Table 2**, the proposed formulas, for most groups, would reduce the number of schools exempt from considering particular subgroups for AYP. In other words, comparing Table 2 to Table 1, the number of schools accountable for particular subgroups would increase in 2006, compared to 2005.
2. For most subgroups, the number of schools projected not to make AYP is approximately the same or close to the number that did not make AYP in 2005 because of the subgroup. The proposed formula could not be said, then, to have the effect of increasing the number of schools making AYP.

Staff recommends that the State Board approve an application to the U. S. Department of Education requesting an amendment to Michigan's subgroup minimum size to use a formula of 30-plus-10% of the total number of students tested in the cohort, to be employed in calculating AYP for the 2006 report cards, with the exception of

small schools, where the minimum group size would be determined by the formula described in Table 2.

Graduation Rates

NCLB requires that AYP determinations for high schools include a measurement of the graduation rate. The Center for Educational Performance and Information has convened an interdepartmental workgroup to develop rules for calculating graduation rates, using a cohort methodology. Additionally, Michigan is committed to using the methodology adopted by the National Governors Association. However, the data collected through the Single Record Student Database (SRSD) will not yet allow a cohort to be followed through high school until 2007-08. Therefore, an interim methodology will be used in the 2006 Report Card.

The graduation rate target for AYP is scheduled to increase from 80% to 85% in 2005-06. The graduation rate targets were set based on the current formula for calculating graduation rate. The currently set targets may not be realistic when a new methodology is used to calculate graduation rates.

Staff recommends that the State Board postpone any increase in the graduation rate target until the method of calculating the graduation rate is changed to the cohort methodology. This will require us to seek approval for this as an amendment to our NCLB Accountability Workbook.

Summary

It is recommended that the State Board of Education approve a request to the U.S. Department of Education to amend Michigan's NCLB Accountability Workbook:

1. To continue to assign a single AYP determination separately for elementary, middle, and high schools respectively, but base this determination on a combination of separate AYP targets for each grade level in a school.
2. To amend the minimum group size for Michigan from thirty (30) to thirty-plus-10%-of-total-students-tested, with a cap of 150, and with the exception of small schools where special rules would apply, described in the superintendent's memo dated December 1, 2005.
3. To maintain the high school graduation rate target of 80% until such future date as Michigan finishes the development of a longitudinal data system that would enable a cohort of students to be tracked through high school.